

169607

USCG 98-3884-7

U.S. COAST GUARD
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION
FOR
DEEPWATER PORTS
(USCG-1998-3884)
33 CFR PARTS 148, 149, AND 150

This rulemaking would revise regulations for Deepwater Ports that date back to the early 1970's. Since then, changes brought about by the Deepwater Ports Modernization Act Amendments of 1996, new developments in the offshore industry, and the need to effectively implement interagency agreements have served to initiate the revision of these regulations. The proposed rule would remove requirements that have proven unnecessary/redundant, and it would ensure that the updated requirements for lifesaving equipment, fire protection, training, and accommodation spaces are consistent with those for other OCS facilities.

This action has been thoroughly reviewed by the Coast Guard, and it has been determined by the undersigned to be categorically excluded from further environmental documentation, under paragraphs 34 (a), (c), (e), and (i), of Section 2.B.2. and Figure 2-1 of the NEPA Implementing Procedures, COMDTINST M16475.1D. Implementation of this action would not result in any:

1. Significant cumulative impacts on the human environment;
2. Substantial controversy or substantial change to existing environmental conditions;
3. Impacts which are more than minimal on properties protected under 4(f) of the DOT Act, as superseded by Public Law 97-449 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; or
4. Inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local laws or administrative determinations relating to the environment.

14 Sept 01
Date

David Houser
Preparer

David Houser
Chief, Standards
Evaluation and
Analysis Division

9/19/01
Date

Ed Wandelt
Environmental Reviewer

Ed Wandelt
Chief, Environmental
Management Division

4/25/02
Date

Paul J. Pluta
Responsible Official

Paul J. Pluta, RADM, USCG
Assistant Commandant,
Marine Safety and
Environmental
Protection

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

NOTE: This checklist should be completed by the decision-maker in consultation with an **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SPECIALIST**. Please read the information on how to properly complete this checklist on pages 4-10 and make sure each question is answered using the accompanying explanations found on the pages cited after each question. Attempting to answer these questions without reading the accompanying explanations may result in an incorrect or incomplete environmental analysis.

***Project Description:**

This proposed rulemaking would revise regulations for Deepwater Ports that date back to the early 1970's. Since then, changes brought about by the Deepwater Ports Modernization Act Amendments of 1996, new developments in the offshore industry, and the need to effectively implement interagency agreements have served to initiate the revision of these regulations. The proposed rule would remove requirements that have proven unnecessary/redundant, and it would ensure that the updated requirements for lifesaving equipment, fire protection, training, and accommodation spaces are consistent with those for other OCS facilities.

Activity Year: 2001

(*Note: Checklist preparer may want to attach additional descriptive information on the proposed action such as: diagrams, site maps, and photographs.)

Part I. Checklist Analysis.

**YES NO NEED
DATA**

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1. Is there likely to be a significant effect on public health or safety? (p. 5) | | X | |
| 2. Does the proposed action occur on or near a unique characteristic of the geographic area, such as a historic or cultural resource, park land, prime farmland, wetland, wild and scenic river, ecologically critical area, or property requiring special consideration under 49 U.S.C. 303(c)? (p. 5-6) | | X | |
| 3. Is there a potential for effects on the quality of the environment that are likely to be highly controversial in terms of scientific validity or public opinion? (p. 7) | | X | |
| 4. Is there a potential for effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks? (p. 7) | | X | |
| 5. Will the action set a precedent for future actions with significant effects or a decision in principle about a future consideration? (p. 7) | | X | |
| 6. Are the action's impacts individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant when considered along with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions? (p. 7-8) | | X | |
| 7. Is the proposed action likely to have a significant impact on a district, site, highway, structure, or object that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or to cause the loss or destruction of a significant scientific, cultural, or historic resource? (p.8) | | X | |
| 8. Will the proposed action have a significant effect on species or habitats protected by the Endangered Species Act? (p. 9) | | X | |
| 9. Is there a potential or threatened violation of a Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (p. 9-10) | | X | |
| 10. Is the action likely to have other significant effects on public health and safety or on any other environmental media or resources that are not specifically identified in this checklist? (p. 10) | | X | |

Part II. Comments or Additional Information Related to Part I:

Part II. Comments or Additional Information Related to Part I (continued):

Part III. Conclusions.

1. A CE is recommended for this proposed action. ☒ [X]
Comments: Since this Coast Guard action falls under #34 (a), (c), (e), and (i), of the Coast Guard's NEPA Implementing Procedures and Policy for Considering Environmental Impacts, COMDTINST M16475.1D, a CE meets this criteria.

2. An EA is recommended for this proposed action. ☐ []

Comments: _____

3. An EIS is recommended for this proposed action. ☐ []

Comments: _____

9/12/01
Date

Bradley K. McKittrick
*Preparer/Environmental Project Manager

Bradley K. McKittrick
Economist, Standards
Evaluation and
Analysis Division

9/19/01
Date

Ed Wandelt
**Environmental Reviewer

Ed Wandelt
Chief, Environmental
Management Division

*The USCG preparer signs for EIS's prepared in-house. The USCG environmental project manager signs for EIS's prepared by an applicant, a contractor, or another outside party.

**Signature of the Environmental Reviewer for the Bridge Administration Program may be that of the preparer's.